ARGUMENTS

The following remarks are respectfully submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 10, 2009. Claims 65-89, 93-95 and 102-110 are pending in the present application. Claims 104, 105 and 107 stand objected under 37 CFR 1.75, as being of improper dependent form. Claims65-89, 93-95 and 104-110 stand rejected under U.S.C 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the enabling disclosure. Claims65-89, 93-95 and 104-110 stand rejected under U.S.C 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regard as the invention.

Regarding claims 65-89, 93-95 and 102-110, Applicant respectfully traverses the office rejections. One of ordinary skill would readily understand the deployment unit as disclosed and would know that the disclosure of a piezoelectric accelerometer as presented in the specification teaches analogue to digital application device that would not require movement on a massive scale, since all communications are in binaries, turning On and Off plurality switches for a specific function to be enabled. The office mentioned of a sliding dashpot is not equivalent to Applicant disclosure of a sliding pot, since a sliding dashpot would require the dashpot to be mounted on the dash, whereas one of ordinary skill would understand that the sliding pot is an element of the deployment unit. The office has not fully given the current application all benefits of its parent applications, including all differences in the subject matters. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 65, one of ordinary skill would know that advanced classification device operable to protect occupant's weight data would require a memory device that is erasable, programmable, and being operable for reading only. The office has not consider further disclosures in current and parent applications, of the many devices which could be used to drive the EPROM. Further, one of ordinary skill would understand that the EPROM is a memory chip comprising electronic component in which a program, data or both can be stored. The EPROM can further be driven by a computer apparatus, which include a CMOS. The office has failed to identify this disclosure in parent applications, and current application is connected to all previously submitted applications. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 65-89, 93-95 and 104-110, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 65-89, 93-95 and 104-110, Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing rejection of claims 65-89, 93-95 and 104-110 are moot in light of the foregoing amendments. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. Claims. Claims 65-89, 93-95 and 104-110 stand rejected under U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steffens et al.,(U.S Pat. Num. 5,413,378) in view of turner et al., (U.S Pat. Num.5,956,703, and Mehney et al (U.S Pat. Num. 6,039,344.) Regarding claims 65-89, 93-95 and 102-110, Applicant respectfully traverses the office rejections. The office has not provided any art to support the rejections of the claims. The limitations of the independent and dependent claims are not disclosed in any of the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing rejection of claims 65-89, 93-95 and 104-110 are moot in light of the foregoing amendments. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested The independent claim 65, as amended, recites "A vehicle occupant seat detection means and weight responsive classification system for controlling the resistance of a supplemental restraint device of a vehicle; comprising:

at least one seat including a seat mounting structure;

at least one weight sensing unit being secured beneath said at least one seat of a vehicle;

at least a computerized system communicatively connecting said weight sensing unit to a supplemental restraint system installed in said vehicle, said supplemental restraint system comprising at least one airbag system each said at least one airbag system having at least one airbag, each said airbag system corresponding to said one of said at least one seat;

said at least one weight sensing unit being configured for taking weight measurements of at least one seated occupant in said at least one seat, further comprising apparatus for converting said weight measurements into varying electrical resistance comprising one or more electrical signals, and communicating said electrical signals to said at least one computerized system;

said at least one computerized system programmably configured to calculate an operating weight value corresponding to said weight measurements for each said at least one seated occupant and communicating said operating weight value to said airbag system corresponding to said one of said at least one seat;

each said airbag system being operatively configured with at least an accelerometer, said accelerometer comprises at least a coil being configured for receiving said operating weight value for said at least one seat and for adjusting a deployment unit within said airbag system to deploy said at least one airbag with a deployment force and acceleration for airbag inflation that are proportionate to said weight measurements;

at least an erasable programmable read only memory "EPROM" being operable for monitoring the weight of at least a seated occupant and for correcting the weight of at least a changing occupant; and

said weight sensing unit responsive to the actual weight of said at least one seated occupant, wherein said airbag system is rendered of sufficient deployment force and acceleration for said airbag inflation to keep said at least one seated occupant on said at least one seat when a collision is sensed, but is not rendered of sufficient deployment force and acceleration for said airbag inflation to cause impact injury to the occupant." Non of the references cited teaches the limitation of the independent claim 65. The subject matters of parent applications are incorporated by reference in the current application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The subject matters cited by the office has corresponding parts in the current application. The claims and the drawings are part of the specification, the field of the invention, and background of the invention. Reconsideration to the specification is respectfully requested.

Respectfully

Joseph Tabe